



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/788,560	01/24/97	YAMAZAKI	S 0756-1626

022204
NIXON PEABODY, LLP
8180 GREENSBORO DRIVE
SUITE 800
MCLEAN VA 22102

MMC1/0815

EXAMINER

NADAV, O

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2811

DATE MAILED:

08/15/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
08/788,560

Applicant(s)
Yamazaki et al.

Examiner
ORI NADAV

Art Unit
2811



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jul 2, 2001
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 78-157 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 78-157 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2811

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 78, 80, 84, 86 and 89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson et al. (4,755,865).

Wilson et al. teaches in figure 3 substantially the entire claimed structure, including a MOS transistor comprising a silicon semiconductor layer 42 comprising a channel region 42B in contact with source and drain regions 42A, 42C at a source/drain-channel boundary, a gate electrode 44 adjacent the channel region with gate insulating film 43 interposed therebetween, and a region 42C formed in the semiconductor layer containing one or more elements selected from a group consisting of carbon, nitrogen and oxygen at a concentration higher than 10E15 atoms per cm cube or more (column 4, lines 39-49), wherein the region is formed in the vicinity of at least one of the source/drain-channel boundary, and wherein the channel region containing boron (column 6, lines 31-32).

Art Unit: 2811

Wilson et al. do not explicitly disclose a channel region containing impurities at a concentration of from 10^{15} to 5×10^{17} atoms per cm cube. However, Wilson et al. teach diffusing impurities at concentration of from 10^{15} to 5×10^{17} atoms per cm cube (column 6, lines 36-37), and under certain processing conditions the channel region can have similar concentration (column 6, lines 64-66). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a channel region containing impurities at a concentration of from 10^{15} to 5×10^{17} atoms per cm in Wilson et al.'s device, since adjusting the amount of impurity concentration in a semiconductor device is a matter of design choice within the skills of an artisan, subject to routine experimentation and optimization.

Regarding claim 84, the claimed limitations of a region having higher energy band gap than any of the source, drain and channel regions is inherent in Wilson et al.'s device, because a region having elements selected from a group consisting of carbon, nitrogen and oxygen, has higher energy band gap than a region containing boron.

3. Claims 78-101, 110-115, 117-127, 129-138 and 146-157 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson et al. (4,755,865) in view of Saito et al. (4,772,927) and Shizukuishi et al. (4,841,348).

Wilson et al. teaches in figure 3 substantially the entire claimed structure, as applied to the claims above. Although Wilson et al. do not explicitly disclose a region of oxygen

Art Unit: 2811

overlapping a portion of the channel region, Wilson et al. teach that the oxygen migrates into the channel region (column 4, lines 56-59). Therefore, Wilson et al. teach a region of oxygen overlapping both a portion of the channel region and a portion of the source/drain region, as claimed.

Wilson et al. do not teach a display device having a plurality of pixels and at least one driver circuit for driving the pixels.

A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951). In this case, using a MOS transistor in a CMOS device, and using the CMOS device as a driver, stagger, inverted stagger, planar and inverted planar type transistors in a peripheral circuit of an active matrix display device having plurality of pixels is a recitation of the intended use of a structure which does not add to the structural limitations in the body of the claim

Furthermore, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. See *In re Casey*,

Art Unit: 2811

152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).

Therefore, the claimed structure is considered to be in at least obvious over the Wilson et al.'s structure.

In the alternative, Saito et al. teach a MOS transistor in figure 1e comprising a semiconductor film comprising crystalline silicon (column 1, lines 19-20) and a channel region 7 in between source and drain regions 6, a gate electrode 9 adjacent the channel region with gate insulating film 5 interposed therebetween, wherein the source and drain regions have at least one portion containing one or more elements selected from a group consisting of carbon, nitrogen and oxygen at a concentration higher than 10^{19} atoms per cm cube or more (column 3, line 49 to column 4, line 24), formed in a CMOS device (figure 2).

Shizukuishi et al. teach a MOS transistor being used in a CMOS device which is part of a peripheral circuit of an active matrix type device having plurality of pixels (abstract), and formed of a semiconductor film comprising amorphous silicon (column 3, line 48).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Wilson et al.'s transistor in a CMOS device which is part of a peripheral circuit of an active matrix type device having plurality of pixels, because it is conventional in the art to connect individual transistors in order to form a CMOS device, and it is well known in the art to use CMOS transistors as drivers in a peripheral

Art Unit: 2811

circuit of an active matrix type device having plurality of pixels. The combination is motivated by the teachings of Saito et al. who point out the advantages of using a TFT transistor having source and drain regions containing carbon, nitrogen or oxygen at a concentration higher than 10^{19} atoms per cm cube or more in a CMOS device.

Regarding claims 78, 89-90, 101, 110-111, 118-119, 126-127, 146-147 and 152-153, although Wilson et al. do not explicitly disclose a channel region containing impurities at a concentration of from 10^{15} to 5×10^{17} atoms per cm cube, Wilson et al. teach diffusing impurities at concentration of from 10^{15} to 5×10^{17} atoms per cm cube (column 6, lines 36-37), and under certain processing conditions the channel region can have similar concentration (column 6, lines 64-66). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a channel region containing impurities at a concentration of from 10^{15} to 5×10^{17} atoms per cm in Wilson et al.'s device, since adjusting the amount of impurity concentration in a semiconductor device is a matter of design choice within the skills of an artisan, subject to routine experimentation and optimization. Saito et al. teach a channel region having at least one portion containing one or more elements selected from a group consisting of carbon, nitrogen and oxygen at a concentration higher than 10^{19} atoms per cm cube or more (column 5, lines 20-23).

Art Unit: 2811

Regarding claim 134, Wilson et al. teach that the oxygen migrates into the channel region (column 4, lines 56-59). Therefore, one boundary of the region is formed in the channel region and the other boundary is formed in one of the source/drain regions.

Regarding claims 83, 95, 125, 133, the claimed limitations of an element concentration in the channel region being lower than that of the element in the region is inherent in Wilson et al.'s device, because the concentration of a region naturally tends to be higher at the center and lower at the periphery of the region.

4. Claim 116 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson et al., Saito et al. and Shizukuishi et al., as applied above, and further in view of Solheim (5,219,784).

Wilson et al. and Saito et al. teach substantially the entire claimed structure, as above, except a threshold voltage of an NMOS being approximately equivalent to that of the PMOS.

Solheim teaches a threshold voltage of an NMOS being approximately equivalent to that of the PMOS (column 4, lines 45-55).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use of a threshold voltage of an NMOS being approximately equivalent to that of the PMOS in Wilson et al. and Saito et al.'s device, since adjusting

Art Unit: 2811

the threshold voltage is a matter of design choice within the skills of an artisan, subject to routine experimentation and optimization, depending on the intended use of the device.

5. Claims 128 and 139 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson et al. and Saito et al., as applied to claims 102, 110, 118, 126 above, and further in view of Higashi et al. (4,694,317).

Wilson et al. and Saito et al. teach substantially the entire claimed structure, including a first interlayer insulating film (ILD) 10 (Saito et al.) comprising inorganic material, and a gate electrode comprising a silicon film containing phosphorus (Wilson et al., column 3, lines 38-40, and column 6, line 32). Wilson et al. and Saito et al. do not teach a second ILD film comprising organic resin and a pixel electrode on the second ILD film formed in a transparent or a reflective device.

Higashi et al. teach in figure 1D a transparent or a reflective device comprising a first interlayer insulating film 5 comprising inorganic material, a second ILD film 7 comprising organic resin and a pixel electrode 11 on the second ILD film (column 3, line 64 to column 4, line 48).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a second ILD film comprising organic resin under a pixel electrode in Wilson et al.'s device, in order to provide better protection for the device.

Art Unit: 2811

The combination is motivated by the teachings of Higashi et al. who point out the advantages of using an organic ILD film under a pixel electrode in a TFT transistor.

6. Claims 102-107, 109 and 140-144 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson et al., Saito et al. and Shizukuishi et al., as applied above, and further in view of Ovshinsky et al. (4,766,471).

Wilson et al., Saito et al. and Shizukuishi et al. teach substantially the entire claimed structure, as applied above, except an element comprising carbon.

Ovshinsky et al. teach elements selected from a group consisting of carbon, nitrogen and oxygen, can widen the band gap in silicon layer containing elements such as germanium or boron. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use an element comprising carbon in Wilson et al., Saito et al. and Shizukuishi et al.'s device, in order to widen the energy band gap of the device. Note that substitution of materials is not patentable even when the substitution is new and useful. *Safetran Systems Corp. v. Federal Sign & Signal Corp.* (DC NIII, 1981) 215 USPQ 979.

Regarding claim 105, although Wilson et al. do not explicitly disclose a channel region containing impurities at a concentration of from 10^{15} to 5×10^{17} atoms per cm cube, Wilson et al. teach diffusing impurities at concentration of from 10^{15} to 5×10^{17}

Art Unit: 2811

atoms per cm cube (column 6, lines 36-37), and under certain processing conditions the channel region can have similar concentration (column 6, lines 64-66). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a channel region containing impurities at a concentration of from 10^{15} to 5×10^{17} atoms per cm in Wilson et al.'s device, since adjusting the amount of impurity concentration in a semiconductor device is a matter of design choice within the skills of an artisan, subject to routine experimentation and optimization.

7. Claim 145 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson et al., Saito et al., Shizukuishi et al. and Ovshinsky et al., as applied above, and further in view of Higashi et al. (4,694,317).

Wilson et al., Saito et al., Shizukuishi et al. and Ovshinsky et al. teach substantially the entire claimed structure, including a first interlayer insulating film (ILD) 10 (Saito et al.) comprising inorganic material, and a gate electrode comprising a silicon film containing phosphorus (Wilson et al., column 3, lines 38-40, and column 6, line 32). Wilson et al., Saito et al., Shizukuishi et al. and Ovshinsky et al. do not teach a second ILD film comprising organic resin and a pixel electrode on the second ILD film formed in a transparent or a reflective device.

Art Unit: 2811

Higashi et al. teach in figure 1D a transparent or a reflective device comprising a first interlayer insulating film 5 comprising inorganic material, a second ILD film 7 comprising organic resin and a pixel electrode 11 on the second ILD film (column 3, line 64 to column 4, line 48).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a second ILD film comprising organic resin under a pixel electrode in the device of Wilson et al., Saito et al., Shizukuishi et al. and Ovshinsky et al., in order to provide better protection for the device. The combination is motivated by the teachings of Higashi et al. who point out the advantages of using an organic ILD film under a pixel electrode in a TFT transistor.

8. Claim 108 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson et al., Saito et al., Shizukuishi et al. and Ovshinsky et al., as applied above, and further in view of Solheim (5,219,784).

Wilson et al., Saito et al., Shizukuishi et al. and Ovshinsky et al. teach substantially the entire claimed structure, as above, except a threshold voltage of an NMOS being approximately equivalent to that of the PMOS.

Solheim teaches a threshold voltage of an NMOS being approximately equivalent to that of the PMOS (column 4, lines 45-55).

Art Unit: 2811

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use of a threshold voltage of an NMOS being approximately equivalent to that of the PMOS in the device of Wilson et al., Saito et al., Shizukuishi et al. and Ovshinsky et al., since adjusting the threshold voltage is a matter of design choice within the skills of an artisan, subject to routine experimentation and optimization, depending on the intended use of the device.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant argues on pages 8-9 that Wilson et al. do not teach one boundary of the oxygen region being formed in the source or drain regions, because the boundary of the oxygen region in the source or drain regions is indeterminate.

Although the boundary of the oxygen region in the source or drain regions is indeterminate, the boundary of the oxygen region is still located in the source or drain regions, as claimed.

10. Applicant argues on page 9 that it is inconclusive whether the channel region of Wilson et al. includes nitrogen at the claimed concentration.

Art Unit: 2811

Although Wilson et al. does not disclose the concentration of nitrogen in the channel region, Saito et al. teach the claimed concentration in the channel region. The rejection is based on combinations of Wilson et al. and Saito et al.

11. Applicant argues on page 9 that Saito et al. do not teach a region of oxygen overlapping both a portion of the channel region and a portion of the source/drain region.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). In this case, Wilson et al. teach a region of oxygen overlapping both a portion of the channel region and a portion of the source/drain region.

12. Applicant argues on page 10 that prior art does not teach a device used as an active matrix type display device.

Although Wilson, Saito, Solheim and Higashi do not disclose an active matrix type display device, Shizukuishi et al. teach an active matrix type display device. In any event, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a

Art Unit: 2811

structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. See *In re Casey*, In this case, the semiconductor device taught by prior art can very well be used as a CMOS transistor in an active matrix type display device.

Moreover, the recitation of an active matrix type display device has occurred in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technology center (TC) 2800 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to TC 2800 via the TC 2800 Fax center located in Crystal Plaza 4, room 4-C23. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). The Group 2811 Fax Center number is (703) 308-7722 and 308-7724. The Group 2811 Fax Center is to be used only for papers related to Group 2811 applications.

Art Unit: 2811

Any inquiry concerning this communication or any earlier communication from the Examiner should be directed to *Examiner Nadav* whose telephone number is **(703) 308-8138**. The Examiner is in the Office generally between the hours of 7 AM to 4 PM (Eastern Standard Time) Monday through Friday.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the **Technology Center Receptionists** whose telephone number is **308-0956**


Sara Crane
Primary Examiner

Ori Nadav

August 14, 2001